



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,022	09/25/2003	Thomas Reilly	J2167.0461	7842

21967 7590 11/27/2007
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

LAZARO, DAVID R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/27/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,022

Applicant(s)

REILLY, THOMAS

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the RCE filed 10/17/2007.
2. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19 and 21 were amended.
3. Claims 1-21 are pending in this office action.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See Response to Arguments.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the "nested web page" limitations have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0054090 by Silva et al. (Silva).
8. Also note U.S. Patent 6,976,210 by Silva et al. (Application 09/650,512) which is incorporated by reference by Silva in paragraph [0010].

Art Unit: 2155

9. With respect to claim 1, Silva teaches a method for incorporating content on a web page comprising:

identifying the content on a different web page (Page 4 [0031] web view allows one to specify the content on the page to be extracted from any web page);

describing a structure of the content on the different web page (Page 4 [0032] structure described through Xpath);

storing the described structure (Page 4 [0036] web view is saved which includes the structure);

retrieving the identified content from the different webpage in real time (Page 5 [0038] content extracted);

comparing a structure of the retrieved content to the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]: mechanisms provided to detect errors related to the application of the xpath expressions against the current structure);

performing processing to ensure that the structure of the retrieved content has retained integrity (Page 5 [0043]); and

incorporating the retrieved content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved content matches the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]: content is incorporated and displayed if no errors are detected).

10. With respect to claim 5, Silva further teaches wherein the step of identifying the content further comprises identifying the content by tags (Page 4 [0032]-[0033]).

Art Unit: 2155

11. With respect to claim 6, Silva further teaches wherein the step of incorporating the content further comprises: rendering the content in a look and feel of the web page (Page 7 [0057]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of U.S. Patent 5,784,058 by LaStrange et al. (LaStrange).

14. Also note U.S. Patent 6,976,210 by Silva et al. (Application 09/650,512) which is incorporated by reference by 2002/0054090 in paragraph [0010].

15. With respect to Claim 2, Silva discloses that if the structure of the retrieved content does not match the stored structure, a notification is sent and the structure will re-described (Page 5 [0043]) which would require retrieving the content and displaying it in a browser window (Page 3 [0025]).

Silva does not explicitly teach generating a new window; and displaying the retrieved content in a new window. LaStrange teaches the generation of a new window and displaying retrieved content in the new window (Col. 5 lines 22-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva and modify it as indicated by LaStrange such that the method further comprises LaStrange teaches generating a new window generating a new window; and displaying the retrieved content in a new window. One would be motivated to have this as it provides a convenient and easy way to display multiple documents (In LaStrange Col. 1 lines 32-35), for example a web view and a web page the user is considering to add to the web view.

16. With respect to claim 3, Silva further teaches sending an alert to an administrator indicating that the structure of the retrieved content does not match the stored structure (In Silva: Page 5 [0043]).

17. With respect to claim 4, Silva further teaches re-describing the structure of the retrieved content; and storing the re-described structure (In Silva: page 5 [0043]).

18. Claims 7, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of U.S. Patent 7,203,909 by Horvitz et al. (Horvitz).

19. With respect to claim 7, Silva teaches a method for incorporating content on a web page comprising:

identifying the content on a web site not containing the web page (Page 4 [0031] web view allows one to specify the content on the page to be extracted from any web page);

describing a structure of the content (Page 4 [0032] structure described through Xpath);

storing the described structure (Page 4 [0036] web view is saved which includes the structure);

retrieving different content from the website in real time (Page 5 [0038] content extracted);

comparing a structure of the retrieved different content to the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]: mechanisms provided to detect errors related to the application of the xpath expressions against the current structure); and

incorporating the retrieved different content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved different content matches the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]: content is incorporated and displayed if no errors are detected).

Silva does not explicitly disclose the incorporation of the retrieved different content on the web page is done by utilizing a nested web page. Horvitz shows that retrieved clipped content can be incorporated through the use nested web pages (Col. 15 lines 32-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the technique disclosed by Horvitz of incorporating content through nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva. Using a known technique of incorporating retrieved content through the use of nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

20. With respect to claim 11, Silva further teaches wherein the step of identifying the content further comprises identifying the content by tags (In Silva: Page 4 [0032]-[0033]).

Art Unit: 2155

21. With respect to claim 12, Silva further teaches wherein the step of incorporating the content further comprises: rendering the content in a look and feel of the web page (In Silva: Page 7 [0057]).

22. With respect to Claim 19, Silva teaches a method for incorporating content on a web page comprising:

identifying first content on a different web page (Page 4 [0031] web view allows one to specify the content on the page to be extracted from any web page);

identifying second content on a web site not containing the web page (Page 4[0031], Page 2 [0010], incorporated Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

describing a structure of the first content, the structure being denoted as a first structure (Page 4 [0032] structure described through Xpath);

describing a structure of the second content, the structure being denoted as a second structure (Page 4 [0032], Page 2 [0010], incorporated Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

storing the first and second structures (Page 4 [0036] web view is saved which includes the structure);

retrieving the first content from the different webpage in real time (Page 5 [0038] content extracted);

comparing a structure of the retrieved first content to the stored first structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]: mechanisms provided to detect errors related to the application of the xpath expressions against the current structure);

incorporating the retrieved first content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved content matches the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]: content is incorporated and displayed if no errors are detected);

retrieving second content from the website in real time incorporated (Page 5 [0038]; Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

comparing a structure of the retrieved second content to the stored second structure incorporated (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]; Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24); and

incorporating the retrieved second content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved second content matches the stored second structure incorporated (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]; Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24).

Silva does not explicitly disclose the incorporation of the retrieved first and second content on the web page is done by utilizing a nested web page. Horvitz shows that retrieved clipped content can be incorporated through the use nested web pages (Col. 15 lines 32-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the technique disclosed by Horvitz of incorporating content through nested web pages to incorporate

Art Unit: 2155

the retrieved content of Silva. Using a known technique of incorporating retrieved content through the use of nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

23. With respect to Claim 20, Silva further teaches establishing a secure session with the web site (In Silva: Page 7 [0038]).

24. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Horvitz and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,784,058 by LaStrange et al. (LaStrange).

25. Also note U.S. Patent 6,976,210 by Silva et al. (Application 09/650,512) which is incorporated by reference by 2002/0054090 in paragraph [0010].

26. With respect to Claim 8, Silva in view of Horvitz further discloses that if the structure of the retrieved different content does not match the stored structure, a notification is sent and the structure will re-described (In Silva: Page 5 [0043]) which would require retrieving the content and displaying it in a browser window (In Silva: Page 3 [0025]).

Silva in view of Horvitz does not explicitly teach generating a new window; and displaying the retrieved different content in a new window. LaStrange teaches the generation of a new window and displaying retrieved content in the new window (Col. 5 lines 22-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva in view of Horvitz and modify it as indicated by LaStrange such that the method further comprises LaStrange teaches generating a new window generating a new window; and displaying the retrieved different content in a new window. One would be motivated to have this as it provides a convenient and easy way to display multiple documents (In LaStrange Col. 1 lines 32-35), for example a web view and a web page the user is considering to add to the web view.

27. With respect to claim 9, Silva in view of Horvitz further teaches sending an alert to an administrator indicating that the structure of the retrieved different content does not match the stored structure (In Silva: Page 5 [0043]).

28. With respect to claim 10, Silva in view of Horvitz further teaches re-describing the structure of the retrieved different content; and storing the re-described structure (In Silva: page 5 [0043]).

29. Claims 13, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0021862 by Schroeder et al. (Schroeder) and Horvitz.

30. With respect to Claim 13, Silva teaches a method for incorporating content on a web page comprising:

identifying the content on a different web page, the content containing at least one URL (Page 4 [0031] web view allows one to specify the content on the page to be extracted from any web page, including those with URLs);

retrieving the identified content from the different webpage in real time (Page 5 [0038] content extracted);

performing processing to ensure that the structure of the retrieved content has retained integrity (Page 5 [0043]); and

incorporating the retrieved content on the web page (Page 7 [0057]).

Silva does not explicitly disclose storing a list of at least one proscribed Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and a corresponding alternative URL and activating the corresponding alternative URL if the at least one proscribed URL is selected.

Schroeder teaches storing a list of proscribed URLs and corresponding alternative URLs (Page 4 [0054]). This allows the corresponding alternative URL to be activated when the proscribed URL is selected (Page 4 [0054]-[0056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva and modify it as indicated by Schroeder such that the method further comprises storing a list of at least one proscribed Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and a corresponding alternative URL, identifying the content on a different web page, the content containing the at least one proscribed URL, and activating the corresponding alternative URL if the at least one proscribed URL is selected. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to

be able to redirect requests depending on a variety of factors (In Schroeder: Page 2 [0022]).

Furthermore, Silva does not explicitly disclose the incorporation of the retrieved different content on the web page is done by utilizing a nested web page. Horvitz shows that retrieved clipped content can be incorporated through the use nested web pages (Col. 15 lines 32-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the technique disclosed by Horvitz of incorporating content through nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva. Using a known technique of incorporating retrieved content through the use of nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

31. With respect to claim 14, Silva further teaches storing a plurality of proscribed URLs and corresponding alternative URLs; activating a corresponding alternative URL whenever a proscribed URL is selected (In Schroeder: Page 4 [0054]-[0056]).

32. With respect to claim 21, Silva teaches identifying first content on a different web page (Page 4 [0031] web view allows one to specify the content on the page to be extracted from any web page);

identifying second content on a web site not containing the web page (Page 4[0031], Page 2 [0010], incorporated Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

describing a structure of the first content, the structure being denoted as a first structure (Page 4 [0032] structure described through Xpath);

describing a structure of the second content, the structure being denoted as a second structure (Page 4 [0032], Page 2 [0010], incorporated Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

storing the first and second structures (Page 4 [0036] web view is saved which includes the structure);

retrieving the first content from the different webpage in real time (Page 5 [0038] content extracted);

comparing a structure of the retrieved first content to the stored first structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]: mechanisms provided to detect errors related to the application of the xpath expressions against the current structure);

performing processing to ensure that the structure of the first retrieved content has retained integrity (Page 5 [0043])

incorporating the retrieved first content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved content matches the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]: content is incorporated and displayed if no errors are detected);

retrieving second content from the website in real time incorporated (Page 5 [0038]; Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

comparing a structure of the retrieved second content to the stored second structure incorporated (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]; Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24);

performing processing to ensure that the structure of the second retrieved content has retained integrity (Page 5 [0043]); and

incorporating the retrieved second content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved second content matches the stored second structure incorporated (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]; Application 09/650,512 identifies that the web clipping procedure can be repeated for multiple sites, see col. 13, lines 7-24).

Silva does not explicitly disclose storing a list of at least one proscribed Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and a corresponding alternative URL and activating the corresponding alternative URL if the at least one proscribed URL is selected from either the incorporated first content or the incorporated second content. Schroeder teaches storing a list of proscribed URLs and corresponding alternative URLs (Page 4 [0054]). This allows the corresponding alternative URL to be activated when the proscribed URL is selected (Page 4 [0054]-[0056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva and modify it as indicated by Schroeder such that the method further comprises storing a list of at least one proscribed Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and a corresponding alternative URL and activating the corresponding alternative URL if the at least one proscribed URL is selected from either the incorporated first content or the incorporated second content. One would be motivated to have this, as it is desirable to be able to redirect requests depending on a variety of factors (In Schroeder: Page 2 [0022]).

Furthemore, Silva does not explicitly disclose the incorporation of the retrieved first and second content on the web page is done by utilizing a nested web page. Horvitz shows that retrieved clipped content can be incorporated through the use nested web pages (Col. 15 lines 32-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the technique disclosed by Horvitz of incorporating content through nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva. Using a known technique of incorporating retrieved content through the use of nested web pages to incorporate the retrieved content of Silva would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

33. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of LaStrange.

34. With respect to claim 15, Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz does not explicitly disclose storing a second proscribed URLs without a corresponding alternative URLs; and activating the proscribed URL in a new window if the proscribed URL is selected.

LaStrange teaches a proscribed URL will be generated in a new window when the proscribed URL is selected (Col. 5 lines 22-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva in view of Schroeder and

Art Unit: 2155

Horvitz and modify it as indicated by LaStrange such that it further comprises storing a second proscribed URLs without a corresponding alternative URLs; and activating the proscribed URL in a new window if the proscribed URL is selected. One would be motivated to have this as it provides a convenient and easy way to display multiple documents (In LaStrange Col. 1 lines 32-35), for example a web view and a web page the user is considering to add to the web view.

35. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,052,730 by Felciano et al. (Felciano).

36. With respect to claim 16, Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz further teaches the web page is customized for a particular user (In Silva Page 7 [0057]).

Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz does not explicitly disclose wherein proscribed URL contains information not customized for the user and wherein the corresponding alternative URL is customized for the user. Felciano teaches a URL that contains information not customized for the user can be substituted with a alternative URL that contains information customized for the user (Col. 6 line 63 - Col. 7 line 23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz and modify it as indicated by LaStrange such that it further comprises wherein proscribed URL contains information not customized for the user and wherein the corresponding alternative URL is customized for the user. One would be motivated to

have this, as it is desirable to customize a web experience of a user through the use of alternative URLs (In Felciano: Col. 7 lines 15-23).

37. With respect to Claim 17, Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz further teaches wherein information on the proscribed URL is inconsistent with information on the corresponding alternative URL (In Schroeder: Page 4 [0054] alternative URL replaces information of the proscribed)

38. With respect to Claim 18, Silva in view of Schroeder and Horvitz further teaches wherein corresponding alternative URL contains customized pricing information (In Felciano: Col. 7 lines 24-43).

Response to Arguments

39. Applicant's arguments filed 10/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

40. Applicant argues on page 9 of the remarks - *"However, based on applicant's review of the teachings of Silva, Applicant submits that Silva does not disclose the particulars of claim 1, as amended. In particular, Silva fails to teach "performing processing to ensure that the structure of the retrieved content has retained integrity." In contrast, as described previously, Silva teaches that the extraction expressions are made robust to changes to Web pages, such that components may be extracted "even if the node positions happen to change." Silva, paragraph 42. Also, Silva's teachings in paragraph 0041 fail to teach such claimed features as recited in claim 1. Silva teaches that "since Web pages may change between the time of creation and execution of a Web view, the system uses techniques to ensure ... that the correct fragments are extracted --- even when the underlying pages are modified." Therefore, Silva does not teach the recited claim feature."*

a. Examiner's response - Again, paragraph 43 is Silva states, "Even though the heuristics that have been developed are **robust to minor changes in the page structure, they can still break if the page structure changes radically.**" (emphasis added). As such, it is clear that Silva is aware that not all changes can be adapted for by the invention. Particularly, if the integrity of the page structure "changes radically" then the heuristics will not work. This why Silva includes a mechanism to check the page structure as described in paragraph 43. The examiner considers this mechanism to be within the scope of the limitation "performing processing to ensure that the structure of the retrieved content has retained integrity". Applicant appears to have applied a narrow interpretation of "integrity". The examiner asserts that the invention of Silva would consider retrieved content to have maintained integrity when minor changes to the page structure occur as the object of interest can still be found. However, radical changes to the page structure means the retrieved content will not have maintained the integrity.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



David Lazaro
November 20, 2007



PHILIP TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER